

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 22 2006

Patent

112.P14211

REMARKS

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 28, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as "the office action"). Reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the office action, claims 1-4 and 6-17 were rejected. Claim 5 was previously canceled. Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending in the application. The rejections of the office action are responded to, below.

Claim rejections – 35 USC §102

In the above referenced office action the Examiner stated that claims 1-8 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Palevich et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,630,131 (hereinafter referred to as "Palevich"). However, claim 5 was previously canceled. The Examiner went on to specifically reject claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Therefore, Assignee respectfully assumes that the Examiner intended to reject only claims 1-4, 6-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As to claim 1, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the patent to Palevich et al at least does not teach or disclose:

searching an external language file associated with the desired language;

locating a language string within the external language file;

The Examiner indicated in paragraph one, on page three of the office action that "searching an external language file associated with the desired language" is described in col. 6

112.P14211

Patent

lines 44-58 of Palevich. Assignee respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Palevich, at col. 6 lines 44-58 seems to disclose various files that may be stored on an external media device but fails to disclose an "external language file." Additionally, Assignee respectfully asserts that "searching an external language file associated with the desired language" is not disclosed anywhere in Palevich.

The Examiner indicated in the office action that "locating a language string within the external language file" is disclosed in col. 12, lines 1-11 of Palevich. Assignee respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Col. 12, lines 1-11 of Palevich seems to disclose that text strings in some object may need to be translated; however, Palevich fails to disclose how such translation may be accomplished. The Examiner is kindly reminded that:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.01 (emphasis added)

Assignee respectfully submits that independent claim 10 distinguishes from Palevich on at least the same or similar basis. Additionally, Assignee respectfully submits that claims 2-8 and 11-16 which depend from claims 1 and 10, distinguish from Palevich on at least the same or similar basis as claims 1 and 10. Thus, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 1-8 and 10-16.

Claim rejections – 35 USC §103

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palevich in view of Chou, U.S. Patent No. 5,583,761 (hereinafter referred to as "Chou").

112.P14211

Patent

The Examiner cited Palevich in rejecting claims 9 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Chou. The Examiner is kindly reminded that:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Assignee's disclosure." MPEP § 2143. (emphasis added)

Assignee respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The cited references do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 9 and 17. As discussed above with respect to the anticipation rejection, Palevich does not disclose all of the claim limitations of claims 1 and 10 from which claims 9 and 17 depend, respectively. Chou does not cure the deficiencies of Palevich. Therefore, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejections to claims 9 and 17.

It is believed that the foregoing arguments address all of the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, Assignee respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-4, 6 -17 on this ground be withdrawn. Assignee respectfully submits that claims 1-4, 6 -17 are in condition for allowance.

112.P14211

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERPatent

SEP 22 2006

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.


Any fees or extensions of time believed to be due in connection with this response are enclosed herein; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account 50-3703.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, Michelle C. Craig, at (503) 439-6500 if there remains any issue with allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Berkeley Law & Technology Group, LLC

Dated: Sept. 22, 2006
Michelle C. Craig
Reg. No. 52,776

Customer Number: 00043831

1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006
503.439.6500